



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,788	04/16/2004	Fabrice Chimienti	20349-564	1282

30623 7590 09/27/2005

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY
AND POPEO, P.C.
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER
BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER

LOCKARD, JON MCCLELLAND

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1647

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/826,788

Applicant(s)

CHIMIENTI ET AL.

Examiner

Jon M. Lockard

Art Unit

1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-59 and 61-79 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-79 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of I, claims 1-12 and 50, drawn to a method for treating a neurological disorder in a subject by administering an effective amount of SLURP-1, in the reply filed on 27 July 2005 is acknowledged. Because Applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP §818.03(a)).
2. It is noted that the previous restriction requirement was in error for including claim 50 in Group I, it should have recited claim 60.
3. Claims 13-59 and 61-79 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 27 July 2005.

Status of Application, Amendments, and/or Claims

4. The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 1647, Examiner Jon Lockard.
5. Upon further consideration, the Examiner has determined that claims within elected Invention I are directed to three patentably distinct methods. Accordingly, a second restriction requirement is set forth below.

Art Unit: 1647

6. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-7, 9-12, and 60, in so far as they are drawn to a method for treating a neurological disorder in a subject by administering an effective amount of SLURP-1 protein, classified in class 514, subclass 2, for example.
- II. Claims 1-8, 11-12, and 60, in so far as they are drawn to a method for treating a neurological disorder in a subject by administering an effective amount of a vector expressing the SLURP-1 protein, classified in class 514, subclass 44, for example.
- III. Claims 1-7, 11-12, and 60, in so far as they are drawn to a method for treating a neurological disorder in a subject by administering an effective amount of SLURP-1 mimetic, classification dependent upon compound structure.

7. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

8. Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in M.P.E.P. § 806.05 for inventive Inventions that are directed to different methods, restriction is deemed to be proper because these methods appear to constitute patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons: Inventions I, II, and III are directed to methods that are distinct both physically and functionally, and are not required one for the other.

9. Invention I requires search and consideration of administering a protein, which is not required by Inventions II or III. Invention II requires search and consideration of administering a nucleic acid, which is not required by Inventions I or III. Invention III requires search and consideration of administering a mimetic, which is not required by Inventions I or II. Therefore, each method is divergent in materials and steps. For these reasons, Inventions I, II, and III are

Art Unit: 1647

patentably distinct. Furthermore, the distinct steps and products require separate and distinct, non-coextensive searches. The inventions of Groups I, II, and III have a separate status in the art as shown by their separate search requirements and different classifications. As such, it would be burdensome to search the inventions of Groups I, II, and III together.

10. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, separate search requirements, and/or different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

11. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

12. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 1647

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Jon M. Lockard, Ph.D.** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-2717**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Brenda Brumback**, can be reached on **(571) 272-0961**.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (toll-free).

JML

September 20, 2005

Bridget C. Bunner

**BRIDGET BUNNER
PATENT EXAMINER**